DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 386 467 TM 023 835

TITLE	Math Assessment Alternatives.
INSTITUTION	Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, OR. Test Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Jun 93
NOTE	49p.
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Techniques; *Educational Assessment; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Mathematics Achievement; *Mathematics Instruction; Mathematics Tests; Portfolios (Background Materials); *Student Evaluation; *Test Construction; Test Items
IDENTIFIERS	*Alternative Assessment; *Performance Based Evaluation; Vermont

ABSTRACT

The articles in this bibliography represent holdings to date in the area of assessment alternatives in mathematics. The annotated articles are intended mainly to stimulate thinking and provide ideas. Some of the entries are formal assessments and are intended mainly for the classroom. Other articles discuss performance based assessment and other alternative assessments for elementary and secondary grades. Test construction is the focus of the majority of these articles. Several articles focus on the development of performance-based assessment and portfolios in Vermont. In all, 108 articles are listed alphabetically by author. (SLD)

TAC B-448

TM/SE

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

THE TEST CENTER
101 SW Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204
(503) 275-9500
(800) 547-6339 (Outside Oregon)

THE TEST CENTER

ED 386 467

MATH ASSESSMENT ALTERNATIVES

June 1993

The following articles represent Test Center holdings to date in the area of assessment alternatives in mathematics. Presence on the list does not necessarily imply endorsement. Articles are included to stimulate thinking and provide ideas. Some of the entries are formal assessments, and are intended mainly for the classroom. For more information, contact Dr. Judy Arter, Unit Manager, or Matthew Whitaker, Test Center Clerk, at (503) 275-9582, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 101 SW Main, Suite 500, Portland, Oregon 97204.

Algina, James, and Sue Legg (Eds.). ***Special Issue: The National Assessment of Educational Progress.*** **Located in: Journal of Educational Measurement, 29, Summer 1992.**

This special issue of JEM discusses the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)--history, specification of content and design of assessments for 1992 and beyond, how students are sampled, and how results are reported. Although some articles are somewhat technical, the general pieces on NAEP's history, and the design of current assessments will be interesting to the general readership.

The current plans for math include:

1. Use of calculators for about 70 percent of the test.
2. Estimation skills tasks using an audio tape.
3. Yes/No questions to determine the extent to which students understand the same information when it is presented in different forms.
4. Constructed response questions in which students are asked to document their solutions by drawing their answers, writing explanations, or providing their computations

Scoring guides for open-ended questions are tailored to each question. Some examples are provided.

(TC# 150.6JEM292)

Appalachia Educational Laboratory. ***Alternative Assessments in Math and Science: Moving Toward a Moving Target,*** **1992. Available from: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, PO Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325, (304) 347-0400.**

This document reports on a two-year study by the Virginia Education Association and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory. In the study, 11 pairs of K-12 science and math teachers designed and implemented new methods of evaluating student competence and application of knowledge.

Teachers who participated in the study found that the changes in assessment methods led to changes in their teaching methods, improvements in student learning and better student attitudes. Instruction became more integrated across subjects and shifted from being teacher-driven to being student-driven. Teachers acted more as facilitators of learning rather than dispensers of information.

Included in the report is a list of recommendations for implementing alternative assessments, a list of criteria for effective assessment, and 22 sample activities (with objectives, tasks, and scoring guidelines) for elementary, middle, and high school students, all designed and tested by the teachers in the study.

Most activities have performance criteria that are holistic and specific to each exercise. No technical information or sample student work is included.

(TC# 600.3ALTASM)

Bagley, Theresa, and Catarina Gallenberger. ***Assessing Students' Dispositions: Using Journals to Improve Students' Performance.*** **Located in: The Mathematics Teacher, 85, November 1992, pp. 660-663.**

In this article, the authors discuss the use of journals to elicit behavior that can be examined for high school students' attitude toward math, making mathematical connections, and understanding. They present many questions, tasks, and instructions for getting students to self-reflect, and provide good, practical suggestions for managing the process. However, the authors do not provide criteria for examining student responses (i.e., what to look for in responses that are indicators of attitude, connections or understanding), so the procedure is informal. The procedure will only be useful to the extent that users have the expertise to know what to look for in responses

(TC# 500.6ASSSTD)

Barton, Paul E. ***National Standards for Education: What They Might Look Like; A Workbook*****, 1992. Available from: Educational Testing Service, Policy Information Center, Mail Stop 04-R, Princeton, NJ 08541, (609) 734-5694.**

This monograph presents examples of standards from eight different projects. The intent is to illustrate and document some existing standards, help policy makers sharpen their thinking about standards, and help people develop common concepts of standards. The eight samples come from NCTM Math Standards, Project 2061 in science, Advanced Placement US History, NAEP Science Objectives, Toronto Benchmarks in math and language arts, NAEP Geography Objectives, National Curriculum in England and Wales in math, and Florida Department of Education on general definitions of terms.

(TC# 500.5NATSTE)

Baxter, Gail P., Richard J. Shavelson, Sally J. Herman, Katharine A. Brown, and James R. Valadez. ***Mathematics Performance Assessment: Technical Quality and Diverse Student Impact.*** **Located in: Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 1993, 24, 3, pp. 190-216.**

The authors developed 41 hands-on tasks to measure three categories of sixth-grade student competencies: measurement (seven tasks), place value (31 tasks), and probability (three tasks). An example of a measurement task is "describe the object" in which students had to write a description of an object that someone else could use to draw the object. Sixteen of the place value tasks were "card shark" in which students were dealt cards with four numbers (e.g., 6000, 100, 60 and 2). They had to put the cards together to form a specified number, read the number aloud, and name the place value of a particular digit. An example of a probability task was "spin it" in which students were given a spinner with eight sections (four orange, three yellow, and one green). They had to predict which color the pointer would land on most or least often, predict the outcome of 32 spins, and carry out the experiment and graph the results

Responses were scored either by degree of "correctness" or, in the case of the communication items (e.g., describe an object), holistically for general quality of the response. The tasks and criteria were described only in general terms; further information would have to be obtained from the authors in order to actually reproduce the assessment.

Tasks were pilot tested with 40 sixth graders (Anglo and Hispanic) from two types of instructional settings: hands-on and traditional. Results showed: raters using this type of rating scheme can be trained to be very consistent in their scoring; the assessments are costly and time-consuming; a considerable number of tasks need to be administered to provide a reliable estimate of a student's level of achievement; student performances on the hands-on tasks differed by the type of instructional setting (evidence of validity); and there was differential scoring on the part of Hispanics, leading to some equity concerns

(TC# 500.6MATPEA)

Braswell, James. ***Overview of Changes in the SAT Mathematics Test in 1994. [SAT Mathematics--Student Produced Responses],*** **1991. Available from: Educational Testing Service, Rosedale Rd., Princeton, NJ 08541, (609) 734-5686.**

This was a paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, April 5, 1991, Chicago.

Currently, the SAT-Math consists of two parts: regular multiple-choice and quantitative comparison (e.g., solution A is larger than, smaller than, or equal to, solution B, or cannot be determined). A third part called "student-produced responses" will be included on the PSAT in 1993 and the SAT in 1994. In this part, students will solve problems that have integer, fractional, or decimal solutions in the range 0 to 9999. A grid is provided for students to enter their actual answer Some problems will have more than one right answer or can be any value in a range. For these problems, a correct response is recorded if the student answer is one of the accepted answers. Of the 55-60 items on the test, 10-15 will be in this format.

The materials include a couple of examples of this type of item.

(TC# 500.3SATMAS)

Brown, Larry. ***Portfolios in Rural High School Mathematics and Science Classes,*** **1992. Available from: Cusick High School, PO Box 270, Cusick, WA 99119, (509) 445-1125.**

This project is still in the developmental process, but is intended to develop the concept that the portfolio is a student's self-selected, self-reflective documentation of growth in understanding and skill over the course of a school year. Students will prepare their portfolios across the curriculum areas of advanced mathematics and physics. Results of the project will be presented together with recommendations for improvement and implications for future work to the Cusick School District, participants of SMART (NWREL), and at the Small Schools Conference at Central Washington University on March 19, 1993.

The author only provided a description of his project. Additional information is available only from the author.

(TC# 660.6PORRUH)

California State Department of Education. ***A Question of Thinking: A First Look at Students' Performance on Open-Ended Questions in Mathematics,*** **1989. Available from: California State Department of Education, PO Box 944272, Sacramento, CA 94244-2720, (916) 445-1260.**

This report describes the results of 12th grade student assessment using open-ended math problems that were part of the California Assessment Program (CAP). The open-ended problems were scored using rubrics developed for each problem These rubrics are described, and "anchor" papers for the six scale values for each rubric are provided Although there is a

separate rubric for each problem, they are all intended to reflect the following dimensions of problem solving: understanding of mathematics, use of mathematical knowledge, and ability to communicate about mathematics.

(TC# 500.3AQUESO)

Campbell, Donna. *Arizona Student Assessment Plan, (ASAP)*, 1990. Available from: Arizona Department of Education, 1535 W. Jefferson, Phoenix, AZ 85007, (602) 542-5393.

The Arizona Assessment Program has several parts: a short standardized achievement test, non-test indicators, and performance assessments in reading, math and writing. The performance tests are designed to measure the state's Essential Skills. The math portion presents an extended problem-solving situation that requires short answers, extended answers, and explanations of answers Each extended exercise has its own specific set of scoring procedures that involve assigning a point value if various things are present in the response.

(TC# 060.3ARISTA)

Carpenter, Thomas P., James Hiebert, Elizabeth Fennema, Karen Fuson, Alwyn Olivier, and Diana Wearne. *A Framework for the Analysis of Teaching and Learning Understanding of Multidigit Numbers.* Information on date and availability is unknown.

This paper presents a way to analyze instruction in math to see whether it is designed to foster understanding, defined as making relevant connections between knowledge. The specific example in the paper relates to multidigit numbers. Dimensions of instruction thought to be critical in promoting understanding include such things as: the scope and sequence of concepts, connections among representations as a basis for establishing meaning for symbols, the nature of problem solving, teacher specification of solution procedures and connections, students' articulation of solution procedures, and coherence between and within lessons

Most of the paper describes each of these dimensions in detail. Several pages at the end discuss in general terms the kinds of tasks one could give to students to see whether they are making the appropriate connections.

(TC# 500.4FRAANT)

Center for Innovation in Education. *Math Their Way*, 1990. Available from: Center for Innovation in Education, 19225 Vineyard Ln., Saratoga, CA 95070, (408) 867-3167.

Math Their Way is an instructional program designed for grades K-2 that emphasizes manipulatives Chapter 3 deals with assessment, the suggested assessment activities tie into the instructional program. These are suggested "formal assessments" to be used to track student progress two to four times a year They are really not intended for daily use There

are 18 assessments to evaluate three areas--prenumber concepts and skills, number operations, and place value. All assessments are individual and performance based. No technical information is provided.

(TC# 070.3MATTHW)

Champagne, Audrey B. ***Cognitive Research on Thinking in Academic Science and Mathematics: Implications for Practice and Policy.*** **Located in: Enhancing Thinking Skills in the Sciences and Mathematics, Diane Halpern (Ed.), 1992. Available from: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publisher, 365 Broadway, Hillsdale, NJ 07642, (800) 926-6579.**

Although this article is not strictly about assessment, it discusses some topics of relevance to assessment. Specifically, it has a very nice section on the relationship between the tasks given to students and what they can learn. For example, students can't learn as efficiently to integrate knowledge if they are never given tasks that require them to do this. This also has relevance to designing "authentic" tasks for performance assessments.

(TC# 000.6COGRET)

Charles, Randall. ***Evaluating Progress in Problem Solving*****, 1989. Located in: Communicator, 14, 2, pp. 4-6. Also available from: The California Mathematics Council, 1414 S. Wallis, Santa Maria, CA 93454, (805) 925-0774.**

This article presents a rationale for analyzing student open-ended problem solving in a systematic fashion. One sample analytical scoring rubric is presented. The traits are: understanding the problem, planning a solution, and getting the answer. The author also proposes some other questions to ask as one looks at student problem solving: Did the student seem to understand the problem? Were the approaches used to solve the problem feasible for finding a solution? Does the answer make sense in terms of the question to be answered?

(TC# 500.3EVAPRI)

Charles, Randall, Frank Lester, and Phares O'Daffer. ***How to Evaluate Progress in Problem Solving*****, 1987. Available from: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1906 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091.**

This monograph attempts to assist educators with the challenge of developing new techniques for evaluating the effectiveness of instruction in problem solving by clarifying the goals of problem-solving instruction, and illustrating how various evaluation techniques can be used in practice. Goals include: select and use problem-solving strategies, develop helpful attitudes and beliefs, use related knowledge, monitor and evaluate thinking while solving problems, solve problems in cooperative learning situations, and find correct answers

Evaluation strategies include: informal observation/questioning and recording results using anecdotal records or a checklist (two are provided); interviews (a sample interview plan is provided); student written or oral self-report of what's happening during a problem-solving experience (a list of stimulus questions is given, as is a checklist of strategies), attitude inventories (two are given); rating scales (three-trait analytic and focused holistic scales are given); and multiple-choice and completion (sample items are given to assess various problem solving abilities; many of these parallel question types mentioned by Marshall, above, to assess procedural and schematic knowledge).

Many sample problems are provided. No student sample performances or technical information is provided.

(TC# 500.6HOWTOE)

Clark, David. *The Mathematics Curriculum and Teaching Program*, 1988. Available from: Curriculum Development Centre, PO Box 34, Woden, ACT 2606, Australia. Also available from: ERIC ED 287 722.

This document was developed to assist classroom teachers to improve their day-to-day assessment of mathematics. Content includes: rationale for assessment alternatives in mathematics, instructions for a two-day in-service program using the materials, instructions on how classroom teachers can use the materials without training, and a series of exercises, formats and ideas for classroom assessment.

Assessment ideas include: help with systematically recording information from informal observations using checklists and "folios" of student work, setting up opportunities for assessment by giving students good tasks to do, assessing problem solving, student self-reflection, and communicating results.

This is written in a very user-friendly manner and contains some good ideas, especially in the areas of designing tasks, problem solving and self-reflection. We found some of the descriptions of activities a little too sketchy.

(TC# 500.3MCTPMA)

Coalition of Essential Schools. [*Various Articles on Exhibitions of Mastery and Setting Standards*], 1982-1992. Available from: Coalition of Essential Schools, Brown University, Box 1969, One Davol Sq., Providence, RI 02912, (401) 863-3384.

Although not strictly about science, this series of articles discusses performance assessment topics and goals for students that are of relevance to math. The articles are: *Rethinking Standards; Performances and Exhibitions: The Demonstration of Mastery; Exhibitions: Facing Outward, Pointing Inward; Steps in Planning Backwards; Anatomy of an Exhibition*, and *The Process of Planning Backwards*

These articles touch on the following topics: good assessment tasks to give students, the need for good performance criteria, the need to have clear targets for students that are then translated into instruction and assessment, definition and examples of performance assessments, brief descriptions of some cross-disciplinary tasks, the value in planning performance assessments, and the notion of planning backwards (creating a vision for a high school graduate, taking stock of current efforts to fulfill this vision, and then planning backward throughout K-12 to make sure that we are getting students ready from the start).

(TC# 150.6VARARD)

Colison, J. *Connecticut's Common Core of Learning*, 1990. Available from: Performance Assessment Project, Connecticut Department of Education, Box 2219, Hartford, CT 06145, (203) 566-4001.

The Connecticut Department of Education is developing a series of performance assessments in science and math. Each task has three parts: individual work to activate previous knowledge, group work to plan and carry out the task, and individual work to check for application of learning. This document provides:

1. A lengthy description of one of the ninth grade science tasks: "speeders."
2. Short descriptions of 24 performance tasks in science (8 each in chemistry, physics, and earth sciences), and 18 in math.
3. A group discussion self-evaluation form to be used by students.

No technical information or general scoring guides are included in this document.

(TC# 600.3CONSCI)

Collis, Kevin F. and Thomas A. Romberg. *Assessment of Mathematical Performance: An Analysis of Open-ended Test Items*, 1989. Available from: National Center for Research in Mathematical Sciences Education, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin, School of Education, 1025 W. Johnson St., Madison, WI 53706, (608) 263-4200.

This paper discusses the implications of research on cognitive development in math for designing assessments. This discussion leads up to some general considerations for assessment design and a general summary of current assessment trends. Some sample test items are provided to illustrate some of the points. Also some sample performance assessment-type items are shown, but they are not critiqued in light of the previous discussion

(TC# 500.6ASSMAP)

Collis, Kevin F. and Thomas A. Romberg. *Collis-Romberg Mathematical Problem Solving Profiles*, 1992. Available from: Australian Council for Educational Research Limited, Radford House, Frederick Street, Hawthorn, Victoria 3122, Australia. Also available from: ASHE, PO Box 31576, Richmond, VA 23294, (804) 741-8991.

This assessment device for students in grades 5 and 2 has 20 open-ended problems to solve--one problem in each of five areas (algebra, chance, measurement, number, and space) with four questions per problem area. Each question is designed to tap a developmental level of formal reasoning. For example, the "A" question determines whether the student can use one obvious piece of information from the item, while the "D" question determines whether the student can use an abstract general principle or hypothesis derived from the information in the problem.

Responses to each question are scored right/wrong. The number of correct responses on each task determine a developmental level. Suggestions are given for instructional strategies for the various developmental levels. Technical information in the manual includes typical performance for various grade levels, teacher judgment on the developmental level indicated by each task, and additional analyses to show validity of the inferences drawn.

(TC# 500.3COLROM)

Commission on Standards for School Mathematics. *Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics*, 1989. Available from: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1906 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091.

This book contains standards for curriculum and assessment that attempt to create a coherent vision of what it means to be mathematically literate. This book has been quoted extensively and appears to be the current "standard" for what should be in a math curriculum

The assessment section covers: three statements of philosophy concerning assessment (alignment, multiple sources of information, and appropriate assessment methods and uses); seven sections on assessing various student outcomes (e.g., problem solving, communication, reasoning, concepts, procedures, and dispositions); and four sections on program evaluation (indicators, resources, instruction, and evaluation team). Each of the seven sections on assessing student outcomes briefly describes what the assessment should cover and provides some sample assessment tasks and procedures.

(TC# 500.5CURANE)

Csongor, Julianna E. *Mirror, Mirror On The Wall...Teaching Self-Assessment to Students.* Located in: The Mathematics Teacher, 85, November 1992, pp. 636-637. Also available from: Saint Maria Gosetti High School, 10th and Moore, Philadelphia, PA 19148.

The author presents a procedure for getting high school students to self-reflect in math: during the final five minutes of a test, students estimate how sure they are about each answer

they gave on the test (100%, 75%, 50%, or 0%). They can earn extra credit on the test if their estimates fall within 3% of their actual score. She reports that students are surprisingly accurate in their estimates and that the procedure works especially well with slow learners.

(TC# 500.3MIRMIW)

EQUALS. *Assessment Alternatives in Mathematics*, 1989. Available from: University of California, Lawrence Hall of Science, Berkeley, CA 94720, (415) 642-1823.

This document provides an overview of some possible assessment methods in mathematics that cover both process and products. Specific examples are provided for writing in mathematics, mathematical investigations, open-ended questions, performance assessment, observations, interviews, and student self-assessment Any of the student-generated material could be self-selected for a portfolio of work. The document also includes a discussion of assessment issues and a list of probing questions teachers can use during instruction.

(TC# 500.6ASSALI)

Ferguson, Shelly. *Zeroing in on Math Abilities*, 1992. Located in: Learning92, 21, pp. 38-41.

The paper was written by a fourth grade teacher and describes her use of portfolios in math -- what she has students put in their portfolios, the role of self-reflection, getting parents involved, and grading. She gives a lot of practical help. One interesting idea in the paper has to do with grading. At the end of the grading period she reviews the portfolios for attainment of concepts taught (not amount of work done), and progress toward six goals set by the NCTM standards (e.g., thinks mathematically, communicates mathematically, and uses tools). She marks which goals were illustrated by the various pieces of work in the portfolio and writes a narrative to the student.

Another interesting idea is formal presentations of their portfolios by students to their parents The article provides a sample comment form for parents and students to complete.

(TC# 500.3ZERMAA)

Fitzpatrick, Anne R., Kadriye Ercikan, and Steven Ferrara. *An Analysis of the Technical Characteristics of Scoring Rules for Constructed-Response Items*, 1992. Available from: CTB Macmillan/McGraw-Hill, PO Box 150, Monterey, CA 93942-0150, (800) 538-9547.

This was a paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, San Francisco, April 1992

This paper reports on a technical study of the open-response portion of the 1991 administration of the Maryland state tests in reading and math. Items had a variety of scoring

formats including different number of possible points and scoring tied to individual tasks Results showed that the math open-response questions were hard, discriminated well between students having different achievement levels, and worked better when more score points were used. Thus, there is evidence that this set of open-response questions might offer more measurement accuracy than multiple-choice questions.

(TC# 060.6ANATEC)

Fitzpatrick, Robert and Edward J. Morrison. ***Performance and Product Evaluation.*** **Located in: Educational Performance Assessment, Fredrick L. Finch (Ed.), 1991. Available from: The Riverside Publishing Company, 8420 Bryn Mawr Ave., Chicago, IL 60631, (800) 323-9540.**

This paper has interesting discussions of the following topics:

1. What "authenticity" in tasks means. The authors' position is that there are many degrees and kinds of artificialities in tests. "Performance and product evaluation are those in which some criterion situation is simulated to a much greater degree than is represented by the usual paper-and-pencil test.... [However,] there is no absolute distinction between performance tests and other classes of tests--the performance test is one that is *relatively* realistic."

2. Criteria for deciding how much "reality" to include in tasks.

3. Descriptions of various types of tasks that can be used in performance assessments in-basket, games, role-plays, projects, etc.

4. Steps for developing performance assessments: analysis of the important dimensions of the skills to be covered, identification of tasks that cover as many of the important skills as possible, developing instructions and materials, and developing the scoring procedure

Most specific examples are taken from military and business applications

(TC# 150.6PERPRE)

Fraser, Barry J., John A. Malone, and Jillian M. Neale. ***Assessing and Improving the Psychosocial Environment of Mathematics Classrooms.*** **Located in: Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 20, 2, 1989, pp. 191-201.**

This article describes the development of a short form of the *My Class Inventory* to be used in sixth grade math classes to measure the psychosocial characteristics of the classroom learning environment, i e , social interactions

(TC# 500.3ASSIMP)

Glaser, Robert. ***Expert Knowledge and Processes of Thinking.*** **Located in: Enhancing Thinking Skills in the Sciences and Mathematics, Diane Halpern (Ed.), 1992. Available from: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publisher, 365 Broadway, Hillsdale, NJ 07642, (800) 926-6579.**

In this article the author describes research on expert performance. Although not directly about assessment, expert performance can be used to help understand and define the targets we have for students, which is the first step toward designing assessment. For example, expert performance can be used to develop criteria for evaluating performance tasks.

The author points out that although expertise is very subject-specific, generalizations can be made about its nature across subjects: experts perceive large, meaningful patterns, have skillful self-regulatory processes, etc.

A critical point made by the author is that, "Practice, as it comes about in the usual course of training, is not necessarily very efficient. On the basis of our knowledge of the specific aspects of competence and expertise, we are able to find ways to compress or shortcut experience...." This is one goal for performance assessment, we help students understand current conceptions of the relevant dimensions of a task so that they don't have to rediscover this themselves.

(TC# 050.6EXPKNP)

Grady, Emily. ***Grady Profile Portfolio Assessment Product Demo,*** **1991. Available from: Aurbach & Associates, Inc., 8233 Tulane Ave., St. Louis, MO 63132, (314) 726-5933.**

This document contains demo materials for a software package that allows the user to collect, store and retrieve a variety of student products and information using a Mac Hypercard system. The document includes a rationale statement for portfolios, a description of the software product, and a demo disk that allows the user to see how the system works with one case example. The user still needs to plan what work will be collected and how to assess progress (although there does appear to be some sort of checklist built into the system).

(Note: the disk and written materials are shelved separately. In the shelf numbers below, "d" is the demo disk, and "t" is the written materials.)

(TC# 000.3GRAPRPd *and* TC# 000.3GRAPRPt)

Grobe, R. P., K. Cline, and J. Rybolt. ***[Mount Diablo] Curriculum Based Assessment For Math: A Summary of 1990 Field-Test Results,*** **1990. Available from: Mt. Diablo Unified School District, 1936 Carlotta Dr., Concord, CA 94519.**

The 1990 project in Mt Diablo Unified School District entailed scoring open-ended math problems holistically on a scale of 0-4. The scale for grades 3, 5 and 8 defines an exemplary response as: systematic or elegant, organized recording system, completed and accurate, and clear and thorough explanation One problem for each grade, along with sample student

responses, is included for each grade level. A rationale for using open-ended problems is also provided. Some information on teacher reactions is included No other technical information is included.

(TC# 500.3MIDLAC)

Hall, Greg. *Alberta Grade 9 Performance-Based Assessment--Math*, 1992. Available from: Greg Hall, Student Evaluation Branch, Alberta Education, Box 43, 11160 Jasper Ave., Edmonton, AB T5K 0L2, Canada.

The 1992 ninth grade math performance assessment entailed six stations with hands-on activities. Students circulate through the stations; testing time for each group of six students is 90 minutes. Some of the six tasks were open-response and some were open-ended; all were assessed for problem solving. The six tasks involved applications of rearranging squares to form different perimeters for the same area, measurement and mapping, surface area, collecting and graphing information, estimation, and combinations/permutations.

Responses were scored using an analytical trait system having two dimensions: problem solving and communication. Each trait was scored on a scale of 0 (totally misunderstood or blank) to 3 (readily understood the task, developed a good strategy, carried out the strategy and generalized the conclusion). A few *possible* student responses are included to illustrate scoring, but no *actual* student responses. No technical information is included.

(TC# 500.3ALBGRN)

Halpern, Diane (Ed.). *Enhancing Thinking Skills in the Sciences and in Mathematics*, 1992. Available from: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 365 Broadway, Hillsdale, NJ 07642, (800) 926-6579.

This book is not strictly about assessment. Rather, it discusses the related topics of "What should we teach students to do?" and "How do we do it?" The seven authors "criticize the conventional approach to teaching science and math, which emphasizes the transmission of factual information and rote procedures applied to inappropriate problems, allows little opportunity for students to engage in scientific or mathematical thinking, and produces inert knowledge and thinking skills limited to a narrow range of academic problems." (p. 118). In general, they recommend that teachers focus on the knowledge structures that students should know, use real tasks, and set up instruction that requires active intellectual engagement

The authors give various suggestions on how to bring this about: instructional methods, videodiscs, group work, and a host more The final chapter analyzes the various positions and raises theoretical issues.

(TC# 500.6ENHTHS)

Harvey, John G. ***Mathematics Testing With Calculators: Ransoming the Hostages.*** **Located in: Mathematics Assessment and Evaluation: Imperatives for Mathematics Educators, Thomas A. Romberg (Ed.), 1992. Available from: State University of New York Press, State University Plaza, Albany, NY 12246.**

This paper looks at the use of calculators in mathematics testing. The premise is that if we want students to investigate, explore and discover, assessment must not just measure mimicry math. Tests designed to really require calculators are more likely to be able to do this. Additionally, it is important to incorporate calculators into the curriculum because in the technological world of the future, calculators will be essential. If we want teachers to use calculators in instruction, we need to incorporate them into testing.

The author analyzes three types of test with respect to calculator use, describes things to consider when designing calculator tests, and describes current activity in developing "calculator-active" tests.

(TC# 500.6MATTEC)

Hawaii Department of Education. ***Using Portfolios: A Handbook for the Chapter 1 Teacher*****, 1991. Available from: Hawaii Department of Education, Chapter 1 Office, 3430 Leahi Ave., Bldg. D, Honolulu, HI 96815, (808) 735-9024.**

This handbook was developed to help teachers explore the possibilities of using portfolios for documenting progress of Chapter 1 students. The handbook includes rationale, philosophy, suggestions for contents, and the tie to Chapter 1 regulations. There are separate sections for reading, writing and math. Each section contains a sample portfolio, sample student outcomes, possible portfolio entries, and other resources.

(TC# 010.6USIPOH)

Illinois State Board of Education. ***Defining and Setting Standards for the Illinois Goal Assessment Program, (IGAP)*****, 1991. Available from: Illinois State Board of Education, 100 N. 1st St., Springfield, IL 62777.**

This paper describes Illinois' procedure for setting standards on the IGAP in grades 3, 6, 8, and 11. The steps include:

1. Creating descriptions of what students look like at three levels of competence: does not meet the state goal for learning, meets the state goal for learning, and exceeds the state goal for learning

2. Judgments by educators of the percent of students at each level that are likely to get each item correct

3. Adjustment of judgments by looking at the actual percentage of students getting the items correct

The paper includes a description of the process and descriptions of students at grades 3, 6, 8, and 11 at each level of competence in math.

(TC# 000.6DEFSES)

Kansas State Board of Education. *Kansas Mathematics Standards and 1991 Kansas Statewide Pilot Assessment Results*, 1991. Available from: Kansas State Board of Education, Kansas State Education Building, 120 SE 10th Ave., Topeka, KS 66612.

This is an overview of the 1991 Kansas pilot math assessment and a description of results. Students from grades 3, 7, and 10 were tested. The pilot included both multiple-choice and open-performance problems. The performance assessment portion entailed giving 1/6 of the students tested one task each. A total of 31 tasks were used altogether in the three grades. Nine problems are included in the report.

Responses were scored using both a holistic scale (0-6) for overall correctness of response, and a four-trait analytic model focusing on problem-solving processes (understanding the question, planning, implementing the strategies selected, and verifying the results). Each trait is rated on a six-point scale (A-F). Scoring guides are included, but detailed instructions and sample student work are not.

Some information on student performance is included, but no other technical information on the test itself.

(TC# 500.3KASMAS)

Kentucky Department of Education. *Kentucky Instructional Results Information System (KIRIS) Open-Response Released Items*, 1991-92. Available from: Advanced Systems in Measurement & Evaluation, Inc., PO Box 1217, 171 Watson Rd., Dover, NH 03820, (603) 749-9102. Also available from: Kentucky Department of Education, Capitol Plaza Tower, 500 Mero St., Frankfurt, KY 40601, (502) 564-4394.

This document contains only the released sets of exercises and related scoring guides from Kentucky's 1991-92 grade 4, 8, and 12 open-response tests in reading, math, science, and social studies. It does not contain any support materials such as: rationale, history, technical information, etc.

There are three to five tasks/exercises at each grade level in each subject. Most are open-response (only one right answer), but some are open-ended (more than one right answer). Examples in math are: write a word problem that requires certain computations, determine how many cubes are needed for a given figure, follow instructions, explain an answer, arrange a room, and explain a graph. Examples in science are: experimental design for spot remover, graph and interpret results of a study on siblings, and predict the weather from a weather map.

Scoring for each exercise is holistic/primary trait Each exercise has its own set of scoring criteria.

Kentucky has given educators permission to copy this document for their own use.

(TC# 060.3KENINR)

Knight, Pam. *How I Use Portfolios in Mathematics*, 1992. Located in: Educational Leadership, 49, pp. 71-72. Also available from: Twin Peaks Middle School, Poway Unified School District, 14012 Valley Springs Road, Poway, CA 92064.

The author describes her first year experimentation with portfolios in her middle school algebra classes. She had her students keep all their work for a period of time and then sort through it to pick entries that would best show their effort and learning in algebra and the activities that had been the most meaningful. There is some help with what she did to get started and discussion of the positive effects on students. There is some mention of performance criteria, but no elaboration. One student self-reflection is included, but no technical information.

(TC# 530.3HOWIUS)

Koretz, Daniel, Daniel McCaffrey, Stephen Klein, Robert Bell, and Brian Stecher. *The Reliability of Scores from the 1992 Vermont Portfolio Assessment Program--Interim Report*, December 1992. Available from: RAND Institute on Education and Training, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, UCLA Graduate School of Education, 10880 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90024, (310) 206-1532.

Beginning in 1990, RAND has been carrying out a multi-faceted evaluation of Vermont's portfolio assessment program. This paper reports on reliability findings of the study conducted during school year 1991-92. Basically, RAND found that interrater agreement on portfolio scores was very low for both writing and math. The authors speculate that this resulted from aspects of scoring systems, aspects of the operation of the program, and the nature and extent of training raters.

This report provides good advise and caution for others setting up portfolio systems for large-scale assessment.

(TC# 150.6RELSCV)

Koretz, Daniel, Brian Stecher, and Edward Deibert. *The Vermont Portfolio Assessment Program: Interim Report on Implementation and Impact, 1991-92 School Year.* **Available from: RAND Institute on Education and Training, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, UCLA Graduate School of Education, 10880 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90024, (310) 206-1532.**

Beginning in 1990, RAND has been carrying out a multi-faceted evaluation of Vermont's portfolio assessment program. This paper reports on questionnaires and interviews conducted during school years 1990-91 and 1991-92. Results indicated that:

1. There was a significant impact on instruction, but teachers felt somewhat confused about what they were supposed to do.

2. The portfolios took a lot of classroom space and tended to be viewed by teachers as an add-on rather than as "the" instruction.

3. Teachers felt they knew more about students as the result of doing portfolios

4. Students had some difficulty doing portfolio problems.

5. Reported effect on low achieving students was mixed.

(TC# 150.6VERPOP)

Kulm, Gerald. (Ed.) *Assessing Higher Order Thinking in Mathematics*, 1990. **Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20005, (301) 645-5643.**

This book contains a series of articles that address various topics in mathematics assessment The articles address three broad topics:

1. The rationale for assessing mathematics problem solving and the need to have assessment devices that reflect this emphasis.

2. Issues that come up when trying to assess higher-order thinking skills in mathematics.

3. General discussions of what to assess and how to assess it.

There are a few examples of actual assessment techniques. The most relevant articles are included on this bibliography as separate entries.

(TC# 500.6ASSHIO)

Lane, Suzanne. ***QUASAR Cognitive Assessment Instrument, (QCAI)*****, 1993. Available from: QUASAR (Quantitative Understanding: Amplifying Student Achievement and Reasoning), Learning Research & Development Center, University of Pittsburgh, 3939 O'Hara St., Pittsburgh, PA 15260, (412) 624-7791.**

The QCAI (QUASAR Cognitive Assessment Instrument) is designed to measure long-term growth of students in the area of math thinking and reasoning skills. Information for this review was taken from the following publications: *Principles for Developing Performance Assessments: An Example of Their Implementation* (Lane & Carol Parke, AERA, 1992); *Empirical Evidence for the Reliability and Validity of Performance Assessments* (Lane, Clement Stone, Robert Ankenmann & Mai Liu, AERA, 1992), *The Conceptual Framework for Development of a Mathematics Performance Assessment Instrument* (Lane, AERA, 1991); *Validity Evidence for Cognitive Complexity of Performance Assessments: An Analysis of Selected QUASAR Tasks* (Maria Magone, Jinfa Cai, Edward Silver, and Nign Wang, AERA, 1992); and *Conceptual and Operational Aspects of Rating Student Responses to Performance Assessments* (Patricia Kenney and Huixing Tang, AERA, 1992)

Thirty-three tasks were designed for sixth and seventh graders. No single student receives more than nine tasks in any 45-minute sitting. The tasks were designed to provide a good sample of math thinking and reasoning skills by having a variety of representations, approaches and problem strategies. Specifically, students were asked to provide a justification for a selected answer or strategy, explain or show how an answer was found, translate a problem into another representation (picture or equation), pose a mathematical question, interpret provided data, and extend a pattern and describe underlying regularities The tasks were carefully field-tested for bias and confusing or difficult instructions. General descriptions for all the tasks, and details on a few individual tasks are provided in these materials.

Scoring is done via a generalized holistic 4-point rubric which directs raters to consider mathematical knowledge, strategic knowledge and communication. (Each of these dimensions is laid out very clearly and could be used as the basis of an analytical trait scoring scale.) The generalized rubric is then applied to each problem by specifying features of responses that would fall at different scale points. The generalized scoring guide is included in these materials, but not the task-specific adaptations.

(TC# 500.3QUACOA)

Larter, Sylvia. ***Benchmarks: The Development of a New Approach to Student Evaluation.*** **1991. Available from: Toronto Board of Education, 155 College Street, Toronto, ON M5T 1P6, CANADA, (416) 598-4931.**

Benchmarks are student performances on tasks tied to Provincial educational goals Each Benchmark activity lists the goals to be addressed, the task, and the scoring system To develop the Benchmarks, two observers were used for each student--one to interact with the student and one to record observations Tasks vary considerably. Some require very discrete responses (e g , knowledge of multiplication facts using whatever means the student needs to

compiete the task), while some are more open-ended. There are 129 Benchmarks developed in language and mathematics for grades 3, 6, and 8.

For many of the tasks, a general, holistic, seven-point scale ("no response" to "exceptional performance [rare]") was used as the basis to develop five-point holistic scoring scales specific to each task. For other tasks, scoring appears to be right/wrong. Holistic scoring seems to emphasize problem solving, method of production, process skills, and accuracy, although students can also be rated on perseverance, confidence, willingness, and prior knowledge, depending on the Benchmark.

The percentage of students at each score point (e.g., 1-5) is given for comparison purposes, as are other statistics (such as norms) when appropriate. Anchor performances (e g., what a "3" performance looks like) are available either on video or in hard copy.

This report describes the philosophy behind Benchmarks, how they were developed, and a few of the specific Benchmarks. Some technical information is described (factor analysis, rater agreement), but no student performances are provided.

(TC# 100.6BENCHM)

Lash, Andrea. *Arithmetic Word Problems: Activities to Engage Students in Problem Analysis*, 1985. Available from: Far West Laboratory, 730 Harrison St., San Francisco, CA 94107, (415) 565-3000.

This is a book of arithmetic word problems selected by the author to promote problem solving. Some are multiple-choice and some are open-response. The author categorizes problems as being "word problems," "process problems," "applied problems," and "puzzle problems." The author also presents a model for the steps in problem solving and a discussion of the implications for instruction. Problems are grouped according to the step in the problem-solving process they relate to.

Most of the problems have only one right answer and none seem to utilize manipulatives However, problems are presented for addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, multi-step problems, and problems containing unnecessary information.

(TC# 500.2ARIWOP)

Lash, Andrea. *An Assessment of Mathematical Problem-Solving Skills*, 1985. Available from: Far West Laboratory, 730 Harrison St., San Francisco, CA 94107, (415) 565-3000.

This monograph describes a study which examined seventh graders' skill in one aspect of mathematical problem solving--problem analysis Problem analysis includes identifying information necessary to solve a problem, separating relevant from irrelevant information.

identifying intermediate steps, and representing the information in a problem with a table or diagram.

The monograph describes possible assessment procedures for problem analysis (rating of open-ended solutions, purposeful multiple-choice), why they selected the latter procedure, and the types of problems that elicit problem analysis skills. The complete instrument is included.

(TC# 510.3ANASSO)

Leach, Eilene L. *An Alternative Form of Evaluation that Complies with NCTM's Standards.* Located in: The Mathematics Teacher, 85, November 1992, pp. 628-632. Also available from Centaurus High School, 10300 S. Boulder Rd., Lafayette, CO 80026.

This teacher uses scored discussions to assess and promote problem solving, communicating mathematically, and group process skills in her high school math classes. She has three to six students face each other in front of the rest of the class and spend about five minutes trying to solve a problem. Individuals can earn positive points for such things as "determining a possible strategy to use," "recognizing misused properties or arithmetic errors," or "moving the discussion along." They can earn negative points by doing such things as: "not paying attention or distracting others," and "monopolizing."

The article has a thorough discussion of how the teacher sets up the classroom, introduces the procedure to students, scores the discussion, and handles logistics. She also discusses the positive effects this procedure has had on students, and the additional insight she has obtained about her students.

All her scoring is teacher-centered, but it wouldn't necessarily have to be. No technical information is included.

(TC# 500.3ALTFOE)

Lehman, Michael. *Assessing Assessment: Investigating a Mathematics Performance Assessment*, 1992. Available from: The National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, 116 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034.

This monograph, by a high school math teacher, describes his attempt to develop a better method of assessing algebra problem solving, concepts, and skills than traditional paper and pencil tests. The assessment technique involves giving students problems to solve as a group, and then having them explain their results in front of a panel of judges. Three examples of problems are provided, as is a brief description of the scoring criteria (making sense of the problem, and problem-solving strategies), accuracy of results, interpreting results, ability to communicate results, and an explanation of what they did. However, these criteria are not elaborated on, and, although samples of student explanations are provided, these are used to describe the understandings the teacher reached about his students, not to anchor the performance criteria

The author also provides a brief summary of the strategies he uses to help students develop greater depth in their understanding of algebraic principals and their interrelationships--small group cooperative learning, requiring justifications of approaches, etc.

(TC# 530.3ASSASI)

Lehman, Michael. *Performance Assessment--Math*, 1992. Available from: Michael Lehman, Holt Senior High School, 1784 Aurelius Rd., Holt, MI 48842, (517) 694-2162.

This paper is related to the one above, and provides additional information. Students are given six problems (some having only one right answer and some having more than one right answer) to solve as a team (four students per team). The team then spends an hour with a panel of three judges. Judges can ask any student to explain the team's solution and problem-solving strategy on any of the six problems. (Therefore, all students must have knowledge of all six problems.) Then the judges assign the team a new problem to work on while they watch.

Student responses are scored on: making sense of the problem, solution strategies, accuracy of results, ability to communicate results, ability to answer questions posed by the judges, three judgments of group process skills, and an overall judgment of student understanding.

A complete set of 10 tasks (six pre-assigned, and four on-the-spot) are included for Algebra II. The scoring guide and a few sample pre-calculus projects are also included. No technical information or sample student performances are included.

(TC# 500.3PERASM)

Lesh, Richard. *Computer-Based Assessment of Higher Order Understandings and Processes in Elementary Mathematics*. Located in: Assessing Higher Order Thinking in Mathematics, Gerald Kulm (Ed.), 1990. Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20005, (301) 645-5643.

This article is as much about how meaningful learning occurs and the nature of the structure of knowledge in mathematics, as it is about use of computers in math instruction and assessment. The basic premise is that computer-based tests should not simply be pencil-and-paper tests delivered on-line. They should be part of an integrated instruction and assessment system that supports both learning facts and developing the meaningful internal structuring of these facts to form a coherent knowledge system.

The article discusses three things:

1. principles underlying a modeling perspective of learning and assessment (ideas such as learning and problem-solving situations are interpreted by the learner by mapping them to internal models, and several "correct" alternative models may be available to interpret a given situation)

2. five objectives that should be emphasized in K-12 math (such as going beyond isolated bits of knowledge to construct well-organized systems of knowledge, and think about thinking)

3. specific types of assessment items that can be used to measure these deeper and broader understandings (such as conceptual networks and interactive word problems)

Many sample problems are provided.

(TC# 500.6COMBAA)

Lester, Frank K, Jr. *An Assessment Model for Mathematical Problem Solving.* Located in: Teaching Thinking and Problem Solving, 10, September/October, 1988, pp. 4-7. Also available from: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Journal Subscription Department, 365 Broadway, Hillsdale, NJ 07642, (800) 962-6579

This article presents a model for assessing both the problem solving performance of students and assessing the task demands of the problem to be solved. The dimensions of problem solving (which could be used as a scoring rubric) are: understanding/formulating the question in a problem, understanding the conditions and variables in the problem, selecting the data needed to solve the problem, formulating subgoals and selecting appropriate solution strategies to pursue, implementing the solution strategy and attaining subgoals, providing an answer in terms of the data in the problem, and evaluating the reasonableness of an answer. The article describes these in some detail.

The problem features that can affect a student's success in solving a problem are: the type of problem, the strategies needed to solve it, the mathematical content/types of numbers used, and the sources from which data need to be obtained to solve the problem.

(TC# 500.3ANASSM)

Lester, Frank K. Jr., and Diana Lambdin-Kroll. *Assessing Student Growth in Mathematical Problem Solving.* Located in: Assessing Higher Order Thinking in Mathematics, Gerald Kulm (Ed.), 1990. Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20005, (301) 645-5643.

The authors present a model of factors that influence problem-solving performance, and discuss several problem-solving assessment techniques.

A good assessment program in math should collect information about the following: affect (attitudes, preferences, and beliefs), and cognitive/processes ability to get the right answer (both whether they get the right answer, and the strategies used). The program should also systematically define and cover the features of tasks (problem type, math content, required strategies, etc.) since these affect performance and should be reflected in instruction

In order to gather information on these three categories of factors, the authors briefly review observations, interviews, student self-reports, and holistic and analytic scoring of performances. They recommend against multiple-choice questions

This paper is a general theoretical discussion, no actual tasks, problems or scoring guidelines are provided.

(TC# 500.6ASSSTG)

Long, Donna J. *Mathematics Proficiency Guide*, 1991. Available from: Indiana Department of Education, Room 229, State House, Indianapolis, IN 46204, (317) 232-9155.

Although not strictly about assessment, this document has a nice description of mathematics proficiencies at various grade levels tied to specific instructional tasks. Proficiencies include: problem solving strategies, reasoning, communication, developing cognitive structures, applying math across the curriculum, and various knowledges (e.g., decimal places, measurement, and geometry).

(TC# 500.5MATPRG)

Marshall, Sandra P. *Assessing Knowledge Structures in Mathematics: A Cognitive Science Perspective.* Located in: Cognitive Assessment of Language and Mathematics Outcomes, Sue Legg & James Algina (Eds.), 1990. Available from: Ablex Publishing Company, 355 Chestnut St., Norwood, NJ 07648.

This article discusses the implications of recent advances in cognitive science for mathematics assessment. The goal in using this research to develop assessment techniques is to determine the extent to which students have acquired specific cognitive skills rather than merely whether they can correctly solve particular problems.

Cognitive theory holds that people solve problems by using three knowledge structures--declarative (facts), procedural (algorithms and production rules), and schema (frames that relate facts and production rules). To solve a problem, a person must first find the right schema, must then correctly implement a set of production rules, and must have stored correctly the facts and knowledge required to carry out the necessary algorithms specified by the production rules. Errors can occur in any of these three areas.

Researchers are currently engaged in specifying these knowledge structures in such detail that they can develop computer simulations that can, first, solve problems, and second, reproduce student errors by leaving out or altering various parts of the necessary structures. In this way, errors in student responses can be tracked back to the erroneous structure used. The author specifically mentions work in the area of simple arithmetic operations, geometry, and word problems

Additionally, the author discusses two other ways of assessing these things in students--reaction time (to assess how automatic a function is), and multiple-choice problems (e.g., "which of the following problems can be solved in the same way as the one stated above?" to get at schema knowledge). Some time is spent with multiple-choice problems to explore various types of problems and the technical issues that arise with them.

It should be pointed out that all these procedures are experimental; none have progressed to the point where there is a final product that can be ordered and installed.

(TC# 500.6ASSKNS)

Marshall, Sandra P. ***The Assessment of Schema Knowledge for Arithmetic Story Problems: A Cognitive Science Perspective*****, 1990. Located in: Assessing Higher Order Thinking in Mathematics, Gerald Kulm (Ed.). Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20005, (301) 645-5643.**

The Story Problem Solver (SPS) was created to support instruction based on a theory of memory architecture called schemata. Under such theories, human memory consists of networks of related pieces of information. Each network is a schema--a collection of well-connected facts, features, algorithms, skills, and/or strategies.

Adult students are explicitly taught five problem-solving schemas and how to recognize which schema is represented by a story problem. SPS is a computerized assessment method in which several different item types are used: students pick out the schema or general solution strategy that fits a given story problem, decide which information in the story problem fits into the various frames of the schema, identify the steps needed to solve a problem, and decide whether the necessary information is given in the problem.

Some of the schema shells and item types are given as examples. No technical information is included

(TC# 500.3ASSOFS)

Maryland Department of Education. ***Maryland School Performance Assessment Program*****, 1991. Available from: Gail Lynn Goldberg, Maryland Department of Education, Maryland School Performance Assessment Program, 200 W. Baltimore St., Baltimore, MD 21201, (410) 333-2000.**

Maryland has released six performance tasks that illustrate the 1992 assessment. This review is based on three of them, one task at each of grades 3, 5 and 8. The tasks are integrated across subject areas and use some combination of information and skills in science, math, writing, reading, and social studies. The three tasks we have relate to the weather (Grade 3), snowy regions of the country (Grade 5) and collisions (Grade 8). Each task has both individual and group work and proceeds through a series of tasks that require reading.

designing and conducting experiments, observing and recording information, and writing up results

Student responses are scored using two basic approaches: generalized holistic or analytical trait scoring guides for the "big" outcomes such as communication skills, problem solving, scientific process, and reasoning; and specific holistic ratings of conceptual knowledge and applications. For example, the task on collisions is scored both for knowledge of the concepts of mass and rate/distance, and for general science process skills (collecting and organizing data, and observation) and communication skills. Thus, some scoring guides are generalized across tasks, and some list specific features from individual tasks to watch for.

The materials we have allude to anchor performances and training materials, but these are not included in our samples. Neither information about student performance, nor technical information about the tests is included.

(TC# 500.3MDSCMA)

Maryland State Department of Education. *Scoring MSPAP (Maryland School Performance Assessment Program): A Teacher's Guide*, 1993. Available from: Gail Lynn Goldberg, Maryland Department of Education, Maryland School Performance Assessment Program, 200 W. Baltimore St., Baltimore, MD 21201, (410) 333-2000.

This document presents information about the 1993 MSPAP: philosophy, general approach, sample tasks, and performance criteria. There are sample tasks, performance criteria and student responses for the following areas: expository, persuasive and expressive writing, reading comprehension, math, science, and social studies.

Scoring can be done three different ways depending on the task: generalized scoring rubrics that can be used across tasks (e.g., persuasive writing); generalized scoring rules that are not as detailed as rubrics (e.g., language usage); and scoring keys that are task-specific (e g , many math tasks are scored for the degree of "correctness" of the response)

No technical information is included.

(TC# 000.3SCOMST)

Maryland State Department of Education. *Teacher to Teacher Talk: Student Performance on MSPAP (Maryland School Performance Assessment Program)*, 1992. Available from: Gail Lynn Goldberg, Maryland Department of Education, Maryland School Performance Assessment Program, 200 W. Baltimore St., Baltimore, MD 21201, (410) 333-2000.

This publication presents teacher reactions to their experience of scoring performance assessment tasks on the 1992 Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) The MSPAP covered reading, writing, math, social studies and science in grades 3, 5, and 8

Comments are organized by grade and subject. Most comments have to do with two topics. what teachers learned about students as the result of participating in the scoring, and how the performance tasks should be revised

(TC# 000.6TEATET)

Marzano, Robert J., Debra J. Pickering, Jo Sue Whisler, et al. *Authentic Assessment*, undated. Available from: Mid-Continent Regional Laboratory (McREL), 2550 S. Parker Rd., Suite 500, Aurora, CO 80014, (303) 337-0990.

This document appears to be a series of handouts used in training. Although not specifically about math, the document does discuss some "big" outcomes related to math such as complex thinking, information processing, communication, etc.

Materials include definitions of assessment terms, a procedure for developing performance assessment tasks, and samples of tasks and scoring guides. The general approach is mix and match--tasks are meant to elicit several target behaviors on the part of students which are then scored with generic performance criteria. For example, a problem-solving task requires students to draw a picture of their neighborhoods without using any circles or squares. Performances are scored for knowledge (geometry), complex thinking (ability to identify obstacles in the way of achieving desired outcomes), and effective communication (ability to express ideas clearly).

Sample tasks are in the areas of science, math and social studies. There are general mix and match scoring guides for: Knowledgeable Person, Complex Thinker, Information Processor, Effector Communicator/Producer, Self-Directed Learner, and Collaborative Worker. Scoring guides are generally not very descriptive. For example, one of the three traits included in the scoring guide for Skilled Information Processor is "effectively interprets and synthesizes information." To get a "4" (the highest score possible) the student "consistently interprets information gathered for tasks in accurate and highly insightful ways and provides synthesis of that information that are highly creative and unique." This is basically just a restatement of the trait title.

The authors have begun to develop a useful approach to performance assessment (mix and match tasks and performance criteria), but the criteria need to be filled out a little more.

(TC# 150.6AUTASS)

Massachusetts Educational Assessment Program. *On Their Own: Student Response to Open-Ended Tests in Mathematics*, [Massachusetts Educational Assessment Program -- *Math Open-Ended and Performance Tasks.*], 1991. Available from: Dr. Allan Hartman, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Education, 1385 Hancock St., Quincy, MA 02169, (617) 770-7334.

The document we received c ained assessment materials for grades 4, 8, and 12 from three years (1988-1990) in four subject areas (reading, social studies, science and math). This entry describes the math portions of the assessments. The 1988 and 1990 materials described open-ended test items in which students had to solve a problem and then explain their answer. In 1988 eight problems were administered to each of the three grades (some problems were repeated between grades). In 1990, ten problems were administered. These problems emphasized the major areas of patterns/relationships, geometry/measurement, and numerical/statistical concepts. All problems were done individually in written format. Problems were distributed in such a way that different students responded to different questions. Responses were scored both for correctness of solution and for quality of the explanation. No specific criteria for judging quality of explanation were given. Many examples of student responses illustrating various conclusions are included.

In 1989, a sample of 2,000 students was assigned one of seven performance tasks (four in math required manipulatives) to do in diads. Each pair was individually watched by an evaluator. Each evaluator could observe between six and ten pairs each day. It took 65 evaluators five days to observe the 2,000 performances. Evaluators were to both check off those things that students did correctly (e.g., measured temperature correctly), and record observations of students' conversations and strategies as completely as possible. A sample checklist of skills includes: measuring, proportional reasoning, equivalency, numeration, attitude, and planning/execution.

Some information on results for all the assessments is provided: percentages of students getting correct answers, using various strategies, using efficient methods, giving good explanations, etc., depending on the task. Many examples of student responses illustrating these various points are provided. No technical information about the assessments themselves is provided.

(TC# 500.3MASOPM)

McTighe, Jay. *Maryland Assessment Consortium: A Collaborative Approach to Performance Assessment*, 1991. Available from: Maryland Assessment Consortium, c/o Frederick County Public Schools, 115 E. Church St., Frederick, MD 21701, (301) 694-1337.

This entry contains handouts from a presentation by the author in 1991. The following topics are covered

1. A description of the consortium--what it is and what it does
2. An overview of the process used for developing performance tasks, and review criteria for performance tasks.
3. Examples of three performance assessment tasks developed by the consortium: one math problem-solving task for grade six and two fifth grade reading tasks. All tasks are

scored using a four-point holistic scoring guide. Scoring appears to be generalized rather than tied to individual tasks. The reading tasks, for example, are scored using the same, generalized scoring guide.

(TC# 500.3MARASC)

McTighe, Jay. *Teaching and Testing in Maryland Today: Education for the 21st Century*, 1992. Available from: Maryland Assessment Consortium, c/o Frederick County Public Schools, 115 E. Church St., Frederick, MD 21701, (301) 694-1337.

This 13-minute video is designed to introduce parents and community members to performance assessment.

(TC# 150.6TEATEMv)

Mead, Nancy. *IAEP (International Assessment of Educational Progress) Performance Assessment (Science and Math)*, 1992. Available from: Educational Testing Service, Rosedale Rd., Princeton, NJ 08541, (609) 734-1526.

This document supplements the report by Brian Semple (also described in this bibliography) (TC# 500.6PERASS). The document contains the administrators manual, scoring guide, equipment cards, and released items from the Second International Assessment of Educational Progress in science and mathematics.

(TC# 500.3IAEPPA)

Medrich, Elliott A., and Jeanne E. Griffith. *International Mathematics and Science Assessments: What Have We Learned?*, 1992. Available from: National Technical Information Service, US Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, VA 22161, (703) 487-4650.

This report provides a description of the international assessments of math and science (First International Mathematics and Science Studies, 1960's; Second International Mathematics and Science Studies, 1980's; and First International Assessment of Educational Progress, 1988), some of their findings, and issues surrounding the collection and analysis of these data. It also offers suggestions about ways in which new data collection procedures could improve the quality of the surveys and the utility of future reports.

(TC# 000.6INTMAS)

Meinhard, Richard. ***A Developmental Baseline Profile of 12 Key Elementary Science Concepts/Processes*****, 1990. Available from: Institute for Developmental Sciences, Oregon Cadre for Assistance to Teachers of Science (OCATS), 3957 E. Burnside, Portland, OR 97214, or by calling (214) 234-4600.**

The OCATS (Oregon Cadre for Assistance to Teachers of Science) project is designed to encourage concept/process-based science education in order to promote long-range student growth in science. One part of this project has been to gather information on how twelve science and math concepts develop in students from K to 5. The concepts are: organization of objects (simple classification, multiple classification, seriation, whole number operations); geometrical and spatial relationships of objects (perimeter, area, multiplicative projective relationships); physical properties of objects (quantity, weight, volume); experimental reasoning (controlling variables); causal explanation (proportional reasoning).

One performance task was given to the students for each concept area. Performance was rated for developmental stage: sensory-motor, pre-operational, operational, and form. Each stage has two substages for a final scale having eight points.

Descriptive information is available for 40 K-5 students. Neither the performance tasks nor the scoring techniques are described in detail in this paper. No technical information, except distribution of performance, is included.

(TC# 600.6DEVBAP)

Meltzer, L. J. ***Surveys of Problem-Solving & Educational Skills*****, 1987. Available from: Educator's Publishing Service, Inc., 75 Moulton St., Cambridge, MA 02138.**

Although this is an individual test published primarily for diagnosing learning disabilities for students aged 9-14, it has some interesting ideas that could be more generally applied. There are two parts to the test--a more-or-less standard individualized aptitude test, and a series of achievement subtests. The math subtest involves a fairly standard test of computation. The interesting part comes in the scoring. Each problem is scored on choice of correct operations, ability to complete the word problem, efficiency of mental computation, self-monitoring, self-correction, attention to operational signs, and attention to detail (one point for evidence of each trait)

After the entire subtest is administered, the teacher is guided through analysis of the student's strategies in completing the task--efficiency of approaching tasks, flexibility in applying strategies, style of approaching tasks, attention to the task, and responsiveness during assessment. (Each area is assigned a maximum of three points for the presence or absence of three specific features of performance. For example, under "efficiency" the students get a point if he or she does not need frequent repeating of instructions, a second point if the student implements the directions rapidly, and a third point if the student perseveres to complete the task) Examples of scoring are included

A fair amount of technical information is included This covers typical performance, factor analysis, inter-rater reliability, relationship to other measures of performance, and comparison of clinical groups.

(TC# 010.3SUROFP)

Mullen, Kenneth B. *Free-Response Mathematics Test*, 1992. Available from: American College Testing Program, PO Box 168, Iowa City, IA 52240, (319) 337-1051.

This was a paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, San Francisco, April 1992.

This paper reports on a study by ACT that compares multiple-choice, open-response, and gridded response item formats on reliability, difficulty and discrimination. In gridded response items, students fill in "bubbles" that correspond to the answer rather than choosing the answer from a given list. "Testlets" were designed to cover the same content and have the same test length for each format. Results indicated that all formats had about the same reliability; there was good rater agreement on the open-ended problems; and grid and open-ended problems discriminated better between students with different achievement levels. The correlation between performances on the various types of items ranged from 0.5 to 0.7.

A few sample problems are provided. All open-response questions used scoring criteria that emphasize degree of correctness of the response and were tied to the task (i.e., there was a different scoring guide for each problem).

(TC# 500.3FREREM)

Mumme, Judy. *Portfolio Assessment in Mathematics*, 1990. Available from: California Mathematics Project, University of California--Santa Barbara, 522 University Rd., Santa Barbara, CA 93106, (805) 961-3190.

This booklet describes what mathematical portfolios are, what might go into such portfolios, how items should be selected, the role of student self-reflection, and what might be looked for in a portfolio. Many student samples are provided. Criteria for evaluating portfolios include evidence of mathematical thinking, quality of activities and investigation, and variety of approaches and investigations No technical information is included.

(TC# 500.6PORASI)

National Science Foundation. *Educating Americans for the 21st Century: A Plan of Action for Improving Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 1983. Available from: National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology, Forms & Publications Unit, 1800 G St. NW, Room 232, Washington, DC 20550, (202) 357-3619.

This is not strictly a document regarding assessment, but rather a statement of what students need to know and be able to do in science and math. As such, it also provides an outline for what assessments should measure.

(TC# 000.5EDUAMF)

Nicholls, John G., Paul Cobb, Erna Yackel, et al. *Students' Theories About Mathematics and Their Mathematical Knowledge: Multiple Dimensions of Assessment.* Located in: Assessing Higher Order Thinking in Mathematics, Gerald Kulm (Ed.), 1990. Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20005, (301) 645-5643.

This paper reports on a series of studies on student attitudes toward mathematics and their relationship to mathematical knowledge and understanding. Dimensions of attitudes toward math were:

1. how motivated students are to do math
2. student beliefs about what causes success in math
3. student views of the benefits of learning math.

All items are included.

(TC# 000.3STUTHA)

Oregon Department of Education. *Oregon Dimensions of Problem Solving*, 1992. Available from: Michael Dalton, Oregon Department of Education, 700 Pringle Parkway, SE, Salem, OR 97310, (503) 378-8004.

The Oregon Department of Education began giving open-ended math problems to a sample of students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 11 in 1992. The five short, written problems used in each grade in 1992 are included in this document, as are student instructions. Responses are scored on four dimensions, or traits: (1) conceptual understanding of the problem--the ability to interpret the problem and select appropriate information to apply a strategy for solution; (2) procedural knowledge--the ability to demonstrate appropriate use of math, (3) skills to solve the problem; and (4) communication--the ability to use math symbols well and ability to explain the problem solution

Each trait is scored on a scale of 1-5 The scoring guides are included in this document along with one sample student problem. No anchor papers or technical information is included.

(TC# 500.3ORDIPS)

Padilla, Michael. ***Group Assessment of Logical Thinking, 1982.*** **Available from: University of Georgia, 212 Aderhold Hall, Athens, GA 30602, (706) 542-3000.**

The two documents we received describe enhanced multiple-choice tests to assess the level of student development from concrete to formal logical thinkers based on Piaget. The test has 21 items for students with a reading level of grade six and above. Six logical operations are assessed: conservation, proportional reasoning, controlling variables, combinatorial reasoning, probabilistic reasoning, and correlational reasoning. Content is taken from the sciences and daily life. Each item is presented pictorially. The student chooses both a statement he or she believes is true about the situation pictured, and the reason for this choice. All items are multiple-choice except for the combinatorial reasoning items for which students list all possible combinations.

There is technical information to support the conclusion that the test can distinguish groups at concrete, transitional, and formal stages of development. The authors recommend using the information obtained to design instruction at the proper developmental level for students. No concrete examples of how to do this are provided.

(TC# 600.3GROASL)

Pandey, Tej. ***Power Items and the Alignment of Curriculum and Assessment.*** **Located in: Assessing Higher Order Thinking in Mathematics, Gerald Kulm (Ed.), 1990. Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20005, (301) 645-5643.**

The author presents a philosophy and approach for thinking about the development of a test of mathematics problem solving, and provides some examples of multiple-choice and short-answer "power" questions developed by the California Assessment Program.

The author maintains that typical content by process matrices used to specify the content of tests tend to result in tests that measure minuscule pieces of information that are fragmented and non-integrated. The author prefers to have assessment tasks that are broader in focus and cut across several process/content areas, so that in order to get the right answer, students must use skills like organizing information, representing problems, and using strategies.

Multiple-choice or short-answer power questions:

1 Assess essential mathematical understandings and inter-connectedness of mathematical ideas, rather than isolated facts and knowledge

2. Are not directly teachable, even though teaching for them will result in good instruction

3. Result in teacher agreement that such questions represent worthwhile teaching goals

(TC# 500.6POWITA)

Pandey, Tej. *A Sampler of Mathematics Assessment*, 1991. Available from: California Department of Education, Bureau of Publications, Sales Unit, PO Box 944272 Sacramento, CA 94244, (916) 445-1260.

This sampler describes the types of assessment that the California Assessment Program (CAP) is proposing to support curricular reforms. Illustrated and discussed are open-ended problems, enhanced multiple-choice questions, investigations, and portfolios. These four types of activities are intended to measure mathematical understandings that students develop over a period of several years.

This monograph includes a definition of "mathematical power"--the ultimate goal of mathematics instruction, guidance in the characteristics of assessment tasks that will encourage and measure power, a few sample student responses to problems, and help with implementation of alternative assessment.

All performance-based techniques will use a six-point holistic scale. This scale is briefly described. The scale will be tailored for individual tasks.

(TC# 500.3SAMMAA)

Paulson, Leon. *Portfolio Guidelines in Primary Math*, 1992. Available from: Multnomah County Educational Service District, PO Box 301039, Portland, OR 97220, (503) 255-1842.

This monograph provides some assistance with getting started with portfolios in the primary grades. The author believes that the most important purpose for mathematics portfolios is to prompt students to take control of their own learning. Therefore, the student should be in control of the portfolio. (The author, however, also points out that there might be other audiences and purposes for the portfolios that might have to be addressed.)

The author provides some ideas for tasks that students could do to generate material for the portfolio, provides some very practical suggestions for getting started, gives ideas for activities to encourage student self-reflection, and shows some draft holistic criteria for evaluating portfolios.

An example of the user-friendly way this monograph provides practical help is: "Remember, the portfolio is telling a story. Each item in a portfolio is there for a reason It should not require a mind reader to figure out why it is there A portfolio entry includes a piece of work

plus information that makes its significance clear--the reason it was selected, the learning goals illustrated, student self-reflections, and (always!) the date."

(TC# 500.6PORGUP)

Paulson, Leon, and Pearl Paulson. *An Afternoon to Remember: A Portfolio Open House for Emotionally Disabled Students*, 1992. Available from: Multnomah County Educational Service District, PO Box 301039, Portland, OR 97220, (503) 255-1842.

Reynolds School District adapted Crow Island's "portfolio night" for use with severely emotionally disabled students. This paper describes how the afternoon was set up, what happened, student debriefing sessions, and changes in format based on student comments.

(TC# 000.6AFTREP)

Pfeiffer, Sherron. *NIM Game Project*, 1992. Available from: Southeast EQUALS, 14 Thornapple Dr., Hendersonville, NC 28739, (704) 692-4078.

The assessment described in this document is a math project task appropriate for upper elementary and middle school students. Two project tasks are included, one individual and one group. The projects require students to create a game that requires application of math skills. These extended projects are used after students have had many opportunities to work with different kinds of NIM games. The extended nature of the project emphasizes persistence and the importance of quality products. Projects become part of a portfolio that shows growth over time.

The projects are scored using criteria specific to these tasks. The criteria revolve around the quality of the game and its usefulness in teaching the math skills specified. The project instructions and scoring guide are included. No sample student work nor technical information is included. This exercise is part of a book of teaching strategies produced by and available from the author: *Successful Teaching Strategies*.

The author has given educators permission to copy this document for their own use

(TC# 500.3NIMGAP)

Pritchard, Diane. *Student Portfolios--Are They Worth the Trouble?*, 1992. Available from: Sisters Middle School, PO Box 555, Sisters, OR 97759, (503) 549-8521.

This paper was written by a middle school math and English teacher. It provides practical help with how to set up a portfolio system in math by describing her purpose for having a portfolio, the types of activities included, and activities to get students to self-reflect (including an idea for tests).

(TC# 500.3STUPOT)

Psychological Corporation. ***GOALS: A Performance-Based Measure of Achievement*****, 1992. Available from: Psychological Corporation, Order Service Center, PO Box 839954, San Antonio, TX 78283, (800) 228-0752.**

GOALS is a series of open-response questions that can be used alone or in conjunction with the MAT-7 or SAT-8, or any achievement test. Three forms are available for 11 levels of the test covering grades 1-12 in the subject areas of science, math, social studies, language and reading. Each test (except language) has ten items. The manual states that the math questions assess student problem solving, communication, reasoning, connections to other subjects, estimation, numeration, geometry, patterns, statistics, probability and algebra. Tasks are multiple, short problems. The manual draws the distinction between the approach taken in *GOALS* (efficiency in large-scale assessment), and the related publication "Integrated Assessment System" which has fewer tasks pursued in more depth.

Responses are scored on a scale of 0-3, where 0 is "response is incorrect" and 3 is "accurate and complete with supporting information." The scoring guide is generalized and is used for all problems. Scoring can be done locally or by the publisher. There is good assistance with scoring philosophy and procedures. There are two sample student performances for each score point for each question.

The holistic scales are combined in various ways to provide indicators of overall conceptual understanding and various specific aspects of problem solving and using procedures. These are, however, not scored directly. Rather, it is analogous to multiple-choice tests in which the correct items are combined in various ways to give subtest scores.

Both norm-referenced (percentiles) and criterion-referenced (how students perform on specific concepts) score reports are available. A full line of report types (individual, summary, etc.) are available.

The materials we obtained did not furnish any technical information about the test itself.

(TC# 510.3GOALS)

Psychological Corporation. ***Integrated Assessment System: Mathematical Performance Assessment*****, 1991. Available from: Psychological Corporation, Order Service Center, PO Box 839954, San Antonio, TX 78283, (800) 228-0752.**

This is a series of 14 tasks designed to be used with students in grades 2-8. Two task booklets were designed for each grade level, but can also be used in spring testing of the grade below or fall testing of the grade above. Each task booklet presents a problem situation that is expanded on and applied to a series of questions For example, various task booklets focus on symmetry, breaking a tie in an election, planning an orchard to maximize yield, and bar codes. Questions involve such things as figuring out an answer and explaining how the solution was reached, and generating a principle and applying it to a new situation

Solutions are scored either holistically (0-6) or analytically (four, 4-point scales). The performance criteria represent generalized features of problem solving and so can be used to score performance on any task. The holistic scale is used to provide an overall picture of performance; raters look for quality of work, evidence of understanding of concepts, logical reasoning, and correct computations. The analytical traits are: reasoning, conceptual knowledge, communication, and procedures. Scoring can be done either locally or by the publisher.

The set of materials we obtained includes a brief description of the scoring rubrics and one example of a scored student test. Technical information was not included.

(TC# 500.3INTASM)

Romberg, Thomas A. *Assessing Mathematics Competence and Achievement*, 1989. Available from: National Center for Research in Mathematical Sciences Education, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, University of Wisconsin, School of Education, 1025 W. Johnson St., Madison, WI 53706, (608) 263-4200.

This paper describes the author's view of what it means to be literate mathematically. It then describes the instructional and assessment implications of this goal. The author believes that we need to assess not only mathematical knowledge but also the structure of the knowledge.

(TC# 500.5ASSMAC)

Romberg, Thomas A. *The Domain Knowledge Strategy for Mathematical Assessment*, 1987. Available from: National Center for Research in Mathematical Sciences Education, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, School of Education, 1025 W. Johnson St., Madison, WI 53706, (608) 263-4200.

This document provides a brief overview of the "Domain Knowledge" strategy used by the National Center for Research in Mathematical Sciences Education to assess math knowledge of students. This approach is contrasted to the typically used "Content by Behavior Matrix" approach in which content topics are crossed with behavior (usually some form of Bloom's taxonomy). The author maintains that this approach is outdated, the behavior dimension fails to reflect contemporary notions of how information is processed and the content dimension is an inadequate way to describe what is meant by "knowing mathematics ".

The "Domain Knowledge" approach involves making a "map" or network of a concept domain This reflects a more integrated and coherent picture about knowledge. These maps can be used to generate tasks, assessment criteria, and formats that get at both "correctness" of responses and the strategies used to arrive at the answer

(TC# 500.6DOMKNS)

Romberg, Thomas A. ***Evaluation: A Coat of Many Colors*****, 1988. Available from: National Center for Research in Mathematical Sciences Education, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, University of Wisconsin, School of Education, 1025 W. Johnson St., Madison, WI 53706, (608) 263-4200. Also located in: Mathematics Assessment and Evaluation: Imperatives for Mathematics Educators, Thomas A. Romberg (Ed.), 1992.**

This paper describes the impact of assessment information on decision making and describes the ways in which assessment must change if it is to have a positive impact on such decisions

(TC# 500.6EVACOM)

Romberg, Thomas A. ***Mathematics Assessment and Evaluation: Imperatives for Mathematics Educators*****, 1992. Available from: State University of New York Press, State University Plaza, Albany, NY 12246.**

This book covers several interesting topics with respect to assessment in math. Specifically:

1. How tests communicate what is valued.
2. How current tests will not promote the recommendations in the NCTM standards.
3. Various considerations when developing tests: calculators, how to adequately model knowledgeable students, etc.
4. Setting up assessment that is intended to influence instruction.

Although authoritative, this book is written in a very academic style, which makes it less accessible to general readers. Articles that are most relevant to this bibliography are entered separately.

(TC# 500.6MATASE)

Romberg, Thomas A., and Linda D. Wilson. ***Alignment of Tests with the Standards.*** **Located in: Arithmetic Teacher, September 1992, pp. 18-22.**

The authors make the argument that teachers teach to tests. Therefore, if we want the NCTM standards to be implemented we need to have tests that reflect the standards. The authors feel that many current norm-referenced tests do not match the standards. Finally, they present tasks from several innovative assessments that they feel do reflect the standards.

(TC# 500.6ALITEW)

Romberg, Thomas A., Linda Wilson, and 'Mamphono Khaketla. *An Examination of Six Standard Mathematics Tests For Grade Eight*, 1989. Available from: National Center for Research in Mathematical Sciences Education, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, School of Education, 1025 W. Johnson St., Madison, WI 53706, (608) 263-4200.

This study is a follow-up to the survey of teachers described above The authors analyzed the six tests most commonly cited by the eighth grade teachers in that study as being used with their students. The authors conclude that the six standardized tests are not appropriate instruments for assessing the content, process, and levels of thinking called for in the NCTM standards.

(TC# 500.6EXASIS)

Romberg, Thomas A., Linda D. Wilson, 'Mamphono Khaketla, and Silvia Chavarria. *Curriculum and Test Alignment*. Located in: Mathematics Assessment and Evaluation: Imperatives for Mathematics Educators, Thomas A. Romberg (Ed.), 1992. Available from: State University of New York Press, State University Plaza, Albany, NY 12246.

This article reports on two studies on the alignment of current standardized tests and alternative assessments to the NCTM standards. Results showed that current standardized tests are weak in five of six content and process areas, and place too much emphasis on procedures and not enough on concepts. The authors present several examples of test questions that they feel do match the standards.

(TC# 500.6CURTEA)

Romberg, Thomas A., E. Anne Zarinnia, and Steven R. Williams. *The Influence of Mandated Testing on Mathematics Instruction: Grade 8 Teachers' Perceptions*, 1989. Available from: National Center for Research in Mathematical Sciences Education, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, School of Education, 1025 W. Johnson St., Madison, WI 53706. (608) 263-4200.

This monograph reports on the first of a sequence of studies on mandated testing in mathematics. This study was a large-scale questionnaire survey to find out from Grade 8 teachers how influential mandated testing was on their teaching of mathematics The results of the study showed that nearly 70 percent of the teachers reported that their students take a mandated test. Secondly, because teachers know the form and character of the tests their students take, most teachers make changes in their teaching to reflect this knowledge. Third, the kinds of changes teachers make are in contrast to the recommendations made by the NCTM standards. Specific examples are given

Although this paper does not describe an alternative assessment device, it does provide reasons for seeking alternative ways of assessing math.

(TC# 500.6INFMAT)

Schoenfeld, Alan H. ***Teaching Mathematical Thinking and Problem Solving.*** **Located in: Toward the Thinking Curriculum: Current Cognitive Research, Loren B. Resnick & Leopold E. Klopfer (Eds.), 1989. Available from: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1250 N. Pitt St., Alexandria, VA 22314-1403, (703) 549-9110.**

Although this article is more about defining what mathematical problem solving is than about assessment, it presents an interesting visual way to represent how students spend their time when solving a problem. It also compares a plot of time use for a good problem solver to a plot for an inefficient problem solver.

Essentially, the plotting procedure involves tracking the sequence in which people use different steps in the problem-solving process (reading the problem, analyzing the problem, exploring a solution strategy, planning, implementing a strategy, and verifying the results) and the amount of time spent on each. Good problem solvers spend a lot of time analyzing and planning, with many self-checks on "how it is going." Poor problem solvers tend to fixate on a possible line of attack and pursue it relentlessly even when it is clearly not going well. Additionally, there are very few stops to self-check on how it is going.

(TC# 500.5STOWTET)

Semple, Brian McLean. ***Performance Assessment: An International Experiment,*** **1991. Available from: Educational Testing Service, The Scottish Office, Education Department, Rosedale Rd., Princeton, NJ 08541, (609) 734-5686.**

Eight math and eight science tasks were given to a sample of thirteen-year-olds in five volunteer countries (Canada, England, Scotland, USSR, and Taiwan). This sample was drawn from the larger group involved in the main assessment. The purpose of the assessment was to provide an information base to participating countries to use as they saw fit, and to examine the use of performance assessments in the context of international studies

The 16 hands-on tasks are arranged in two 8-station circuits. Students spend about five minutes at each station performing a short task. Most tasks are "atomistic" in nature, they measure one small skill. For example, the 8 math tasks concentrate on measuring length, angles, and area, laying out a template on a piece of paper to maximize the number of shapes obtained, producing given figures from triangular cut-outs, etc. Some tasks require students to provide an explanation of what they did. All 16 tasks are included in this document, although some instructions are abbreviated and some diagrams are reduced in size the complete tasks, administration and scoring guides are available from ETS

Most scoring is right/wrong; student explanations are summarized by descriptive categories There is also observation of the products of students' work

Student summary statistics on each task are included. There is a brief summary of teacher reactions, student reactions, the relationship between student performance on various tasks, and the relationship between performance on the multiple-choice and performance portions of the test A few sample student performances are included.

(For related information, see Nancy Mead, also listed in this bibliography.)

(TC# 600.3PERASS)

Silver, Edward A., and Jeremy Kilpatrick. *Testing Mathematical Problem Solving.* Located in: The Teaching and Assessing of Mathematical Problem Solving, Randall Charles and Edward Silver (Eds.), 1988. Available from: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc., 1906 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091.

This paper discusses two topics: how assessment can inform instructional decision making and how it communicates what we value. The authors propose that the National Assessment of Educational Progress and many other math tests do not provide the type of information needed for the improvement of mathematics instruction. The information useful for improvement of instruction would be types of errors kids make, how automatic mathematical processes are, and the cognitive structures and abilities associated with expertise in the domain being tested.

(TC# 500.6TESMAP)

Stalker, Veronica. *Urbandale Alternative Assessment Project*, 1991. Available from: Urbandale Community Schools, 7101 Airline Avenue, Urbandale, IA 50322, (515) 253-2300.

Urbandale High School is "working to implement authentic forms of assessment throughout all of the disciplines." In all subject areas, teachers are asked to develop at least one "authentic" unit in which students are given an engaging task and which are assessed using a pre-defined rubric.

This package contains Urbandale's policy statement setting up this effort, and includes five samples of these units: projects on the environment, earthquakes, writing in math, and American history

In a personal communication, the teacher developing the American history units makes the following points:

1 She has seen students empowered by clear performance targets presented ahead of time

2 Assessment is daily and on-going.

3. Having an "authentic final" did not work if the rest of the class is lecture based Students need practice with open-ended units and performance criteria

4. The biggest challenge is not coming up with the tasks for the "authentic units" but is coming up with good performance criteria, and clearly communicating these to students

5. In the past, she has developed a different set of performance criteria for each task report. However, now she sees that there are common threads through them, and she feels she can come up with a "master rubric" that can apply across many reports. To this master rubric, criteria specific to a given task or report can be added. The master rubric w ' include such things as accuracy of historical facts and how interesting the report is to read.

(TC# 000.3URBALA)

Stenmark, Jean Kerr. *Mathematics Assessment: Myths, Models, Good Questions, and Practical Suggestions*, 1991. Available from: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1906 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091.

This monograph was designed for teachers in the elementary grades. It is a collection of examples of assessment techniques that focus on student thinking. Topics include the rationale for new ways of assessing mathematics, the necessity of integrating assessment and instruction, designing performance assessments (most emphasis is on designing the task, although sample holistic and analytical trait scoring systems are shown), what to look for during classroom observations and interactions (including questions to ask to get at various types of thinking), portfolios (including types of items to include and the types of information they can demonstrate about students, and criteria for evaluation), student self-assessment, and hints to make assessment work in the classroom. No technical information is provided.

(TC# 500.3MATASM)

Surber, John R. *Mapping as a Testing and Diagnostic Device*, 1984. Located in: Spatial Learning Strategies--Techniques, Applications, and Related Issues, C. D. Holley & D. F. Dansereau (Eds.). Available from: Academic Press, 1250 6th Ave., San Diego, CA 92101.

The book is a general discussion of the advantages of, and procedures for, integrating the production of cognitive networks into instruction. The premise is that knowledge of facts, rules, algorithms, etc. is only part of what students need to know. They also need to know how these facts fit together to form a body of knowledge Without knowledge of the interrelationships, students are not likely to remember the facts or be able to use them correctly when they are remembered

The Surber paper discusses a particular type of cognitive networking scheme--mapping--and its use in assessment of knowledge structures. The basic procedure consists of taking a completed map for the topic to be tested, and deleting portions in various ways. Students then complete the map given various types of cues.

(TC# 000.6MAPASA)

Surber, John R., Philip L. Smith, Frederika Harper. *MAP Tests*, 1981 - undated. Available from: John R. Surber, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Department of Educational Psychology, Milwaukee, WI 53201, (414) 229-1122.

Our review is based on four reports from the author: *Testing for Misunderstanding* (John R. Surber and Philip L. Smith, Educational Psychologist, 1981, 16, 3, pp. 165-174; *Technical Report No. 1, Structural Maps of Text as a Learning Assessment Technique: Progress Report for Phase I;* Surber, Smith, and Frederika Harper, undated, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; *Technical Report No. 6, The Relationship Between Map Tests and Multiple Choice Tests,* Surber, Smith and Harper, 1982. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; and *Mapping as a Testing and Diagnostic Device,* Surber: Spatial Learning Strategies, 1984, Academic Press, Inc., pp. 213-233 (also available as TC# 000.6MAPASA).

These reports and papers describe the development of map tests as an assessment technique to identify conceptual misunderstandings that occur when students learn from text. The purpose is to diagnose student understanding in order to plan instruction. In this testing technique, the test developer graphically represents concepts and their interrelationships in a map. Then, information from the map is systematically removed. Students complete the map shells. Four different levels of deletion associated with different types of content clues are described. Maps are scored by comparing the student-completed version to the original. Scoring involves looking both at the content included or omitted from the map and the proper relationship between this content. Report #6 describes scoring in more detail.

The authors did a series of studies on this technique, reported on in "Mapping as a Testing and Diagnostic Device." They found good interrater reliability and good consistency between developers of "master maps." They report on comparisons to multiple-choice tests.

Text maps and tests can be constructed in any content area at any grade level. The specific examples in these materials come from chemistry (matter), study skills, and sociology (the development of early warfare).

A manual, designed to teach students how to construct concept maps, is included in Report #1. The authors have given educators permission to copy these documents for their own use

(TC# 150.6MAPTES)

Szetela, Walter and Cynthia Nicol. *Evaluating Problem Solving in Mathematics.* **Located in: Educational Leadership, May 1992, pp. 42-45.**

This short article presents a statement of the need to assess problem solving, describes steps in the problem-solving process, shows some sample scoring guides, and discusses some question types that prompt problem solving. Scoring guides are somewhat sketchy and no samples of student work are included.

(TC# 500.6EVAPRS)

Vermont Department of Education. *Vermont Mathematics Portfolio Project: Grade Eight Benchmarks*, **1991. Available from: Vermont Department of Education, Vermont Mathematics Portfolio Project, 120 State Street, Montpelier, VT 05602, (802) 828-3135.**

This document provides lots of samples of grade eight student work that illustrate different scores for each of the seven analytical traits used in the Vermont Mathematics Portfolio Project. Samples were taken from the 1991 portfolio pilot.

(TC# 500.3GRAEIB)

Vermont Department of Education. *Vermont Mathematics Portfolio Project: Grade Four Benchmarks*, **1991. Available from: Vermont Department of Education, Vermont Mathematics Portfolio Project, 120 State Street, Montpelier, VT 05602, (802) 828-3135.**

This documents provides lots of samples of grade four student work that illustrate different scores for each of the seven analytical traits used in the Vermont Mathematics Portfolio Project. Samples were taken from the 1991 portfolio pilot.

(TC# 500.3GRAFOB)

Vermont Department of Education. *Looking Beyond "The Answer"--The Report of Vermont's Mathematics Portfolio Assessment Program*, **1991. Available from: Vermont Department of Education, Vermont Mathematics Portfolio Project, 120 State Street, Montpelier, VT 05602, (802) 828-3135.**

This report describes the results of the pilot year of the Vermont's grade 4 and 8 mathematics portfolio system used for large-scale assessment. The report contains information on the rationale for the portfolio approach, a description of what students were to include, a description of the criteria used to evaluate the portfolios (with sample student performances to illustrate the scoring scale), the scoring and training process, results, and what was learned about large-scale assessment using portfolios.

(For related documents, see entries under "Koretz.")

(TC# 500.3REPOFV)

Vermont Department of Education. ***Vermont Mathematics Portfolio Project: Resource Book*****, 1991. Available from: Vermont Department of Education, Vermont Mathematics Portfolio Project, 120 State Street, Montpelier, VT 05602, (802) 828-3135.**

This document includes sample performance tasks taken from portfolio entries submitted by teachers as part of Vermont's 1991 math portfolio pilot project, a resource bibliography, and a list of suggested readings. The purpose is to provide colleagues with tasks that have worked well with students to promote problem solving. *This is meant as a companion document to the Teacher's Guide (TC= 500.3TEAGUI).*

(TC# 500.3RESBOO)

Vermont Department of Education. ***Vermont Mathematics Portfolio Project: Teacher's Guide*****, 1991. Available from: Vermont Department of Education, Vermont Mathematics Portfolio Project, 120 State Street, Montpelier, VT 05602, (802) 828-3135.**

This document presents Vermont's current view of what should go into a mathematics portfolio, provides detailed information about the scoring criteria for portfolio entries and the portfolio as a whole, discusses how to develop tasks that will invite student problem solving, and provides help with how to manage the portfolios. *This is a companion piece to the Resource Book (TC= 500.6RESBOO).*

(TC# 500.3TEAGUI)

Webb, Noreen. ***Alternative Strategies for Measuring Higher Order Thinking Skills in Mathematics: The Role of Symbol Systems*****, 1991. Available from: CRESST, University of California -- Los Angeles, 145 Moore Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90024. (213) 825-4711.**

This document presents an overview of a study that is currently taking place at CRESST in which students are asked to represent problems in various equivalent ways (graphs, tables, equations, word problems, and diagrams). The premise is that if a student really understands a problem, he or she should be able to solve the problem presented in any format, and translate from one format to another. Examples are provided of problems represented in different ways.

(TC# 500.6ALTSTF)

Webb, Norman, and Thomas A. Romberg. ***Implications of the NCTM Standards for Mathematics Assessment.*** **Located in Mathematics Assessment and Evaluation: Imperatives for Mathematics Educators, Thomas A. Romberg (Ed.), 1992. Available from: State University of New York Press, State University Plaza, Albany, NY 12246.**

This paper provides a good summary of the NCTM standards, both goals for students and standards for assessment It uses four of the standards for assessment to develop criteria for assessments

1. The assessment instrument should provide information that will contribute to decisions for the improvement of instruction

2. The assessment instruments should be aligned with the instructional goals, the goals for the overall program, and a holistic conceptualization of mathematical knowledge

3 The assessment instruments should provide information on what a students knows

4 The results from one assessment instrument should be such that when combined with results from other forms of assessment, a global description is obtained of what mathematics a person or group knows

The authors then illustrate their points with several assessment tasks that they feel would elicit the correct behavior from students. (These generally have only one correct answer and appear to be scored for degree of correctness.)

(TC# 500.6IMPNCM)

Wells, Barbara G. *Journal Writing in the Mathematics Classroom.* Located in: Communicator, 15, 1, 1990, pp. 30-31. Also available from: California Mathematics Council, Ruth Hadley, 1414 South Wallis, Santa Maria, CA 93454, (805) 925-0774.

This brief article describes one method that a teacher uses to elicit thinking on the part of high school math students. The teacher puts a short phrase on the board at the beginning of each class period and students write what they know about that phrase as the teacher takes attendance. Sample "prompts" and student responses are included. Although no criteria for evaluating responses are included, this article is added here because it represents an attempt to do writing in math, and because some of the prompts are designed to elicit metacognition, e.g., "What three problems on the final should have been eliminated and why?" or "What mathematical fact, concept, skill or insight that you learned in this class this year are you most likely to remember and why?"

(TC# 500.6JOUWRI)

Whetton, Chris. *An Evaluation of the 1992 National Curriculum Assessment at Key Stage 1 in the Core Subjects*, 1992. Available from: National Foundations for Educational Research (NFER), The Mere, Upton Park, Slough, Berks S11 2DQ, England, United Kingdom.

This set of four documents reports on the results of the 1992 assessment They contain results of surveys of educators, use of the assessments with special education students, overall summary results, and recommendations for the 1993 assessment.

(TC# 060.6EVANAC)

Whetton, Chris. *Key Stage 1, 1992, Teacher's Pack*, 1992. Available from: HMSO Publications Centre, PO Box 276, London, SW8 5DT, England, United Kingdom.

This document contains all administration materials for the 1992 assessment. The assessments consist of a combination of hands-on and paper and pencil activities for primary students. English, science and mathematics are covered. In science and math, some activities are scored for the correctness of the answer and some are scored for correctness of approach or explanation. For example, one math task requires students to sort and tabulate the frequency of objects in a cupboard pictured in the student booklet. (Students get a "correct" mark if they miss no more than one item.) One science task requires students to select and describe five objects. (The response is "correct" if the student describes at least three objects in terms of at least two physical characteristics.)

All tasks are administered by the classroom teacher in large and small group settings. (The 1992 assessment took 24 hours, including English.) *A summary and technical report on the 1992 assessment is cataloged separately (Whetton: TC= 060.6EVANA( )*

(TC# 070.3KEY192)

Whetton, Chris. *Key Stage 1, 1993, Teacher's Pack*, 1993. Available from: HMSO Publications Centre, PO Box 276, London SW8 5DT, England, United Kingdom.

This document contains all administration materials for the 1993 assessment. The assessments consist of a combination of hands-on and paper and pencil activities for primary students. English, science and mathematics are covered. In science and math, some activities are scored for the correctness of the answer and some are scored for correctness of approach or explanation. For example, one math task consisted of adding and subtracting using a small number of objects. (The student must get three out of four correct to be scored as "pass.") One science task has students draw pictures or verbally explain what forces are acting on a raft as it floats on the water. (Responses are scored correct if the student conveys the knowledge that there are forces acting down and up on the raft.) Scoring is always tied directly to the task, and tasks usually are designed to cover discrete skills or pieces of knowledge.

All tasks are administered by the classroom teacher in large and small group settings. Results of the 1993 administration are not yet available, so it is unknown how long the most current version takes. (The 1993 assessment was greatly streamlined from the 1992 assessment which took 24 hours, including English.)

(TC# 070.3KEY193)

Whetton, Chris, Graham Ruddock, Steve Hopkins, et al. *Standard Assessment Tasks for Key Stage 1*, 1991. Available from: HMSO Publications Centre, PO Box 276, London SW8 5DT, England, United Kingdom.

In spring 1991, all seven-year-olds in England and Wales (N=600,000) where tested using a set of performance assessments tied to a new National Curriculum. Areas tested included reading, writing, spelling, handwriting, math, and science. The assessment consisted of a series of tasks given to students. For each task, students were assessed on several "statements of attainment (SoA) [goals in the curriculum]." In math, thirty-eight SoA's were covered in 19 tasks. SoA's included those that are fairly traditional (e.g., "use addition and subtraction facts up to 10") but also included some self-reflection and problem solving (e.g., "talk about own work and ask questions," "make predictions based on experience," "explore and use the patterns in addition and subtraction facts to 10").

This package contains all the materials used by teachers for the age 7 *Standard Assessment Tasks*--administration handbooks, detailed description of tasks and scoring procedures, information recording booklets, and student worksheets. *For related information see other entries from Whetton.*

(TC# 070.3STAAST -- In house use only)

Wilson, Mark. *Measuring Levels of Mathematical Understanding*. Located in: Mathematics Assessment and Evaluation: Imperatives for Mathematics Educators, Thomas A. Romberg (Ed.), 1992. Available from: State University of New York Press, State University Plaza, Albany, NY 12246.

The premise of this article is that if we want students to be reasoners and thinkers, we need to move from tests that fragment knowledge into "atomistic" pieces, each of which are assessed independently of the others, to assessment procedures that reveal student understanding of the concepts in a domain and their interrelationships. Many current tests are based on lists of skills, each of which is tested separately. "The primary focus of a mathematics testing methodology based on an active, constructive view of learning is on revealing how individual students view and think about key concepts in a subject. Rather than comparing students' responses with a 'correct' answer to a question so that each response can be scored right or wrong, the emphasis is on understanding the variety of responses that students make to a question and inferring from those responses students' levels of conceptual understanding "

The author presents a few examples. One is the SOLO taxonomy which looks at degree of formal reasoning. *(See the Collis-Romberg TC= 500.3COLROM on this bibliography.)*

This is a very technical and theoretical article and points up the need to be well grounded in current theory before beginning to develop math assessments

(TC# 500.6MEALEM)

Zarinnia, E. Anne, and Thomas A. Romberg. ***A Framework for the California Assessment Program to Report Students' Achievement in Mathematics.*** **Located in: Mathematics Assessment and Evaluation: Imperatives for Mathematics Educators, Thomas A. Romberg (Ed.), 1992. Available from: State University of New York Press, State University Plaza, Albany, NY 12246.**

This paper takes the position that assessment affects instruction, and therefore, regardless of the other purposes for the assessment, the instructional implications of our assessments must be taken into account. "If one acknowledges student learning as the central mission of schooling, it further suggests that not only the tasks, but also the system and structures for gathering accountability information and reporting the data, should be designed with instructional needs in mind."

Other points made by this paper are:

1. We need to change the view of math held by many teachers and the general public, that math is a set of rules and formalisms invented by experts that everyone else is to memorize. The authors maintain that both the test itself and the way results are reported will influence these perceptions

2. Mathematical power means that citizens can use math to solve day-to-day problems. This means we need to seek evidence of students using, reflecting on, and inventing mathematics in the context of value and policy judgments. These experiences should be built into our instruction and assessments

Implications for turning power over to students are also discussed.

(TC# 500.6FRACAA)